



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,031	09/01/1999	SALMAN AKRAM	3442US(96-42	3303
7590	06/07/2005		EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT & ROSSA PO BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			LEE, EUGENE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/388,031	AKRAM, SALMAN
	Examiner Eugene Lee	Art Unit 2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,7-28,100-104 and 107-129 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,7-15,100,102-104 and 107-115 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hata 0502647 A2 EPO. Hata discloses (see, for example, FIG. 4) a conductive structure (metallization structure) comprising a field oxide layer (substrate) 10, aluminum signal line (metal layer) 18, titanium nitride cap layer (single conducting layer) 22, and tungsten sidewalls (metal spacers) 28, 30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 3, 100, 102, 103, and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO as applied to claims 1, and 10 above, and further in view of Chang et al. 6,281,115 B1. Hata does not disclose a dielectric layer on the substrate upper surface and underlying the metal layer. However, Chang discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3) a conductive structure comprising interconnect metal structures 3 over an insulator layer 2 and

Art Unit: 2815

substrate 1. The insulator layer serves as a base upon which the interconnect metal structures are constructed. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a dielectric layer on the substrate upper surface and underlying the metal layer in order to provide a base for the interconnect structure.

Regarding claims 3 and 103, see, for example, column 3, lines 14-19 wherein Chang discloses the insulator layer comprising silicon oxide or BPSG.

5. Claims 4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO as applied to claims 1, and 10 above, and further in view of Cox 6,166,439. Hata does not disclose the metal layer comprising Ti, Ta, W, Co, or Mo or alloys or compounds thereof, including TaN or TiN. However, Cox discloses (see, for example, column 5, lines 53-61) that the conductive pattern (metal layer) can be titanium. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the metal layer comprising Ti, Ta, W, Co, or Mo or alloys or compounds thereof, including TaN or TiN in order to have conductive patterns with adequate conductivity.

6. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO as applied to claims 1, and 10 above, and further in view of Joshi et al. 6,285,082 B1. Hata does not disclose the single conducting layer being selected from the group comprising aluminum and copper. However, Joshi discloses (see, for example, column 1, lines 20-25, and column 3, lines 65-67) that aluminum and aluminum-copper have low resistivity, superior adhesion, ease of patterning, high purity, and low cost of materials. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2815

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the single conducting layer being selected from the group comprising aluminum and copper in order to have low resistivity, superior adhesion, ease of patterning, high purity, and low cost of materials.

7. Claims 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO as applied to claims 1, and 10 above, and further in view of Liu et al. 6,277,745 B1. Hata does not disclose the metal spacers being titanium or titanium nitride. However, Liu describes (see, for example, column 4, lines 24-29) an interconnect structure comprising protective spacers wherein the protective spacers may comprise Ta, TaN, TiN, or combinations thereof. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the metal spacers being titanium or titanium nitride in order to adequately protect the sidewalls of the interconnect structure.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO as applied to claims 1, and 10 above, and further in view of Dawson 6,677,647 B1. Hata does not disclose a dielectric layer on the single conducting layer and having sidewalls aligned with the sidewalls of the single conducting layer, the metal spacers extending along the sidewalls of the dielectric layer. However, Dawson discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) an interconnect structure comprising a metal line 108 and anti-reflective coating (dielectric layer) 110. In column 2, lines 3-10, Dawson discloses the anti-reflective coating comprising TiN, and further discloses the anti-reflective coating reducing electromigration and serving as an etch stop layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

Art Unit: 2815

to have a dielectric layer on the single conducting layer and having sidewalls aligned with the sidewalls of the single conducting layer, the metal spacers extending along the sidewalls of the dielectric layer in order to reduce electromigration and have an etch stop layer.

9. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Dawson '647 B1 as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Matsuno 6,046,502. Hata in view of Dawson does not disclose a low dielectric constant material and a fluorine-doped silicon oxide. However, Matsuno discloses (see, for example, see column 1, lines 20-63) that dielectric films doped with fluorine provide films with low dielectric constants which have excellent burying properties and lowered propagation delay. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a low dielectric constant material and a fluorine-doped silicon oxide in order to have excellent burying properties and lowered propagation delay.

10. Claims 104, and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Chang et al. '115 B1 as applied to claims 2, 3, 100, 102, 103, and 110 above, and further in view of Cox 6,166,439. Hata in view of Chang does not disclose the metal layer comprising Ti, Ta, W, Co, or Mo or alloys or compounds thereof, including TaN or TiN. However, Cox discloses (see, for example, column 5, lines 53-61) that the conductive pattern (metal layer) can be titanium. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the metal layer comprising Ti, Ta, W, Co, or Mo

or alloys or compounds thereof, including TaN or TiN in order to have conductive patterns with adequate conductivity.

11. Claims 108 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Chang et al. '115 B1 as applied to claims 2, 3, 100, 102, 103 and 110 above, and further in view of Joshi et al. 6,285,082 B1. Hata in view of Chang does not disclose the single conducting layer being selected from the group comprising aluminum and copper. However, Joshi discloses (see, for example, column 1, lines 20-25, and column 3, lines 65-67) that aluminum and aluminum-copper have low resistivity, superior adhesion, ease of patterning, high purity, and low cost of materials. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the single conducting layer being selected from the group comprising aluminum and copper in order to have low resistivity, superior adhesion, ease of patterning, high purity, and low cost of materials.

12. Claims 111, and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Chang et al. '115 B1 as applied to claims 2, 3, 100, 102, 103, and 110 above, and further in view of Liu et al. 6,277,745 B1. Hata in view of Chang does not disclose the metal spacers being titanium or titanium nitride. However, Liu describes (see, for example, column 4, lines 24-29) an interconnect structure comprising protective spacers wherein the protective spacers may comprise Ta, TaN, TiN, or combinations thereof. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the metal

Art Unit: 2815

spacers comprising at least one of Ti, Ta, W, Co, or Mo, or alloys thereof or compounds thereof, including TaN and TiN in order to adequately protect the sidewalls of the interconnect structure.

13. Claim 112 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Chang et al. '115 B1 as applied to claims 2, 3, 100, 102, 103, and 110 above, and further in view of Dawson 6,677,647 B1. Hata in view of Chang does not disclose a dielectric layer on the single conducting layer and having sidewalls aligned with the sidewalls of the single conducting layer, the metal spacers extending along the sidewalls of the dielectric layer. However, Dawson discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) an interconnect structure comprising a metal line 108 and anti-reflective coating (dielectric layer) 110. In column 2, lines 3-10, Dawson discloses the anti-reflective coating comprising TiN, and further discloses the anti-reflective coating reducing electromigration and serving as an etch stop layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a dielectric layer on the single conducting layer and having sidewalls aligned with the sidewalls of the single conducting layer, the metal spacers extending along the sidewalls of the dielectric layer in order to reduce electromigration and have an etch stop layer.

14. Claims 113, and 114 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata 0502647 A2 EPO in view of Chang et al. '115 B1 in view of Dawson '647 B1 as applied to claim 112 above, and further in view of Matsuno 6,046,502. Hata in view of Chang in view of Dawson does not disclose a low dielectric constant material and a fluorine-doped silicon oxide. However, Matsuno discloses (see, for example, see column 1, lines 20-63) that dielectric films

doped with fluorine provide films with low dielectric constants which have excellent burying properties and lowered propagation delay. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a low dielectric constant material and a fluorine-doped silicon oxide in order to have excellent burying properties and lowered propagation delay.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 16 thru 28, 101, and 116 thru 129 are allowed.
16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
The references of record, either singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least "a metallization structure, comprising a substrate having a metal layer extending over the substrate, the metal layer at least underlying a conductive line; a conductive layer of the conductive line in contact with the metal layer and the metal spacer, the metal spacer and the conductive layer substantially filling the aperture, the conductive layer having an upper surface substantially coincident with an upper surface of the dielectric layer" (claims 16-25, and 101).

Regarding claims 26-28, the references of record, either singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least "a metallization structure, comprising a substrate having a metal layer extending over the substrate, the metal layer at least underlying a conductive line; a conductive layer of the conductive line in contact with the metal layer and the metal spacer, the metal spacer and the conductive layer nearly filling the aperture, at least one upper metal layer on the conductive layer, the at least one upper metal layer having an upper surface substantially

coincident with an upper surface of the dielectric layer and an uppermost extent of the metal spacer.”

Regarding claims 116-125, and 129, the references of record, either singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least “a structure for transmitting a signal laterally across a substrate, the structure comprising: a substrate having a metal layer of a conductive line; a conductive layer of the conductive line in contact with the metal layer and the metal spacer, the conductive layer having an upper surface substantially coincident with an upper surface of the dielectric layer.”

Regarding claims 126-128, the references of record, either singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least “a structure for transmitting a signal laterally across a substrate of a semiconductor device, the structure comprising: a substrate having a metal layer of a conductive line disposed thereon; a conductive layer of the conductive line in contact with the metal layer and the metal spacer, the metal spacer and the conductive layer nearly filling the aperture; and at least one upper metal layer on the conductive layer having an upper surface substantially coincident with an upper surface of the dielectric layer and an uppermost extent of the metal spacer.”

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28, and 100-129 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1733. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571-272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eugene Lee
May 27, 2005

